

DMS Notice QC – 08 – 8

November 5, 2008 Discard: Retain

TO WEIGHTS AND MEASURES OFFICIALS

**SUBJECT: Target Corporation Settlement** 

Attached is a stipulation and final judgment involving recent litigation against Target Corporation for violations of the California Business and Professions Code Section 12024.2. We are again very pleased with the fine work done on behalf of the people, by the prosecution team representing Contra Costa, Fresno, Santa Cruz, Marin, and Sonoma County District Attorneys. The settlement specified more than \$1.7 million and includes reimbursements for investigative costs.

The prosecuting counties named above should report these penalties as received by each county in the County Monthly Report (CMR). All participating counties should also separately record their individual investigative cost reimbursements in the appropriate columns in the report. We in weights and measures are pleased with the continued support and hard work from the participating district attorneys.

Sincerely,

Edmund E. Williams

Cc QC Special Investigators

Kevin Masuhara, Director, County/State Liaison

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ROBERT J. KOCHLY, District Attorney of Contra STEVEN C. BOLEN, Deputy District Attorney State Bar Number 141962 627 Perry Street Martinez, California 94553 Telephone: (925) 646-4523 Facsimile: (925) 646-4683 (For list of additional plaintiff's counsel, see attached Exhibit 1)  Attorneys for Plaintiff	a Costa County	
	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10	FOR THE COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA		
11			
12			
13	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	Case No.:	
14	Plaintiff,	CONTRACT ACCION FROM TAXABLE OF	
15	vs.	STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT	
16	TARGET CORPORATION,		
17			
18	Defendant.		
19			
20	Plaintiff, the People of the State of California, appearing through its attorneys, Robert J.		
21	Kochly, Contra Costa County District Attorney, by Steven C. Bolen, Deputy District Attorney;		
22	Stephan R. Passalacqua, Sonoma County District Attorney, by Matthew T. Cheever, Deputy District		
23	Attorney; Edward S. Berberbian, Marin County District Attorney, by Robert E. Nichols, Deputy		
24	District Attorney; Elizabeth Egan, Fresno County District Attorney, by Michael Brummel, Deputy		
25	District Attorney; and Bob Lee, Santa Cruz County District Attorney, by William Atkinson, Assistant		
26	District Attorney and Defendant Target Corporation, appearing through its attorneys Morrison &		
27	Foerster, by David F. McDowell, hereby stipulate and agree as follows:		
		ge 1 of 5	
	People v. Target Corporation STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT la-993677		

la-993677

Dated: September_	_, 2008	STEPHAN R. PASSALACQUA, District Attorney County of Sonoma
		By Matthew T. Cheever, Deputy District Attorney
		Matthew T. Cheever, Deputy District Attorney
Dated: September	, 2008	EDWARD S. BERBERIAN, District Attorney
		County of Marin
		By Robert E. Nichols, Deputy District Attorney
		Robert E. Nichols, Deputy District Attorney
Dated: September	, 2008	ELIZABETH EGAN, District Attorney
		County of Fresno
<b> </b>		By
		Michael Brummel, Deputy District Attorney
Dated: September	, 2008	BOB LEE, District Attorney
		County of Santa Cruz
3		
		By Nillian Addison Anida d District Attached
		William Atkinson, Assistant District Attorney
Dated: September	, 2008	MORRISON & FOERSTER
,		
,   		
		David F. McDowell, Esq.
5		Attorney for Defendant TARGET CORPORATION
,		
		Page 3 of 5

Dated: September 2, 2008

TARGET CORPORATION

By Carter Centry

Page 4 of 5

People v. Target Corporation
STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT

la-993677

# Exhibit 1

1	EXHIBIT 1			
2	ELIZABETH A. EGAN, District Attorney of Fresno County			
3	ROGER WILSON, Deputy District Attorney			
4	State Bar Number 192207 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 100			
5	Fresno, CA 93721 Telephone: (559) 488-2800			
6	Facsimile: (559) 448-2800			
7	EDWARD S. BERBERIAN, District Attorney of Marin County ROBERT E. NICHOLS, Deputy District Attorney			
8	State Bar Number 100028			
9	3501 Civil Center Drive, Room 130 San Rafael, CA 94903			
10	Telephone: (415) 499-6450 Facsimile: (415) 499-3095			
11	BOB LEE, District Attorney of Santa Cruz County			
12	WILLIAM ATKINSON, Deputy District Attorney State Bar Number 88933			
13	701 Ocean Street, Room 200			
14	Santa Cruz, CA 95060 Telephone: (831) 454-2400			
15	STEPHAN PASSALACQUA, District Attorney of Sonoma County			
16	MATTHEW T. CHEEVER, Deputy District Attorney			
17	State Bar Number 191783 Hall of Justice, Second Floor			
18	600 Administration Drive, Room 212-J Santa Rosa, CA 95403			
19	Telephone: (707) 565-2311 Facsimile: (707) 565-2762			
20	Pacsinne. (707) 303-2702			
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
	Page 5 of 5 People v. Target Corporation			
	STIPULATION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT			

Exhibit 2

#### 1 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA 2 3 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, NO. 4 Plaintiff, FINAL JUDGMENT AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION 5 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION ٧. 6 TARGET CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation, 7 Defendant. 8 9 Plaintiff, appearing through its attorneys, Robert Kochly, District Attorney for the County 10 of Contra Costa, by Steven C. Bolen, Deputy District Attorney; Elizabeth Egan, District Attorney 11 for the County of Fresno, by Michael Brummel, Deputy District Attorney; Edward S. Berberian, 12 District Attorney for the County of Marin, by Robert E. Nichols, Deputy District Attorney; Bob 13 Lee, District Attorney for the County of Santa Cruz, by William Atkinson, Deputy District 14 Attorney; and Stephan R. Passalacqua, District Attorney for the County of Sonoma, by Matthew 15 T. Cheever, Deputy District Attorney; and Defendant, TARGET CORPORATION (also referred 16 to herein as "Target"), appearing through its counsel, Morrison and Foerster, by David F. 17 McDowell, Esq.; and 18 Plaintiff and Defendant having stipulated to the entry of this Final Judgment and 19 Permanent Injunction prior to the taking of any proof and without trial or adjudication of any 20 issue of fact or law; and 21 The Court having considered the pleadings; 22 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED as follows: 23 **JURISDICTION** 24 25 1. This action is brought under California law, and this Court has jurisdiction of the 26 subject matter and the parties.

27

28

#### APPLICABILITY

2. The provisions of the Final Judgment are applicable to Defendant, Target Corporation, a Minnesota corporation, and to its officers, directors, representatives, successors, assignees, and all persons, partnerships, corporations, and other entities acting under, by, through, on behalf of, or in concert with, Defendant, with actual or constructive notice of this Final Judgment, in connection with the operation of Target Corporation's California stores (collectively, "Enjoined Persons"). All obligations imposed upon Defendant by the terms of this Final Judgment are ordered pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17535.

#### DEFINITIONS

- 3. For the purposes of this Final Judgment, the following definitions shall apply:
- a. "Advertised Price" means the price that is posted or displayed on the commodity itself or on a shelf tag that corresponds to that commodity or the price for a commodity published in a newspaper, magazine, or direct mail publication. Nothing herein will be construed to mean that a consumer will be eligible for the Advertised Price if he or she fails to qualify under the applicable terms disclosed in conjunction with the Advertised Price, so long as said terms are clearly and conspicuously disclosed. However, any advertised price posted on a commodity itself or on a shelf tag that corresponds to that commodity is subject to Business and Professions Code section 12024.2(a)(2).
- b. "Price Scanning System" means an automated system by which a marking or tag affixed to an item offered for sale to the public is electronically scanned at the Point of Sale ("POS") terminal to determine the identity of the item and the price to be charged for the item.
- c. "POS price" means the price of an item when it is scanned at the POS using the Price Scanning System.
- d. "Pricing Discrepancy" means a variance between the Advertised Price and the POS price. For purposes of this Final Judgment, a Pricing Discrepancy shall not include (1) situations where the variance between the Advertised Price and the POS price is consistent with a clear and conspicuous price correction notice placed on the rack or shelf at each location

the product is displayed and on the advertising board at the front of each store notifying customers of an incorrect Advertised Price; (2) any variance between an Advertised Price and the POS price when merchandise has been correctly stocked but inadvertently moved, transferred or transported to the wrong rack, shelf, display, or fixture by a customer; or (3) any variance which results in a consumer being charged a price lower than the Advertised Price. Defendant shall bear the burden of proof in establishing any exception under this subsection, when the alleged Pricing Discrepancy is brought to its attention within fourteen (14) days of the date on which the alleged Pricing Discrepancy occurred.

- e. "Report of Pricing Discrepancy" means a report of a Pricing Discrepancy by any customer, any employee or agent of a government agency, or any employee of Target.
- f. "Weights and Measures Official" means any representative of (i) the State of California Division of Measurement Standards, (ii) any California County Sealer, (iii) any Director of a California County Department of Agriculture, (iv) the California Attorney General, or (v) any California district or city attorney.

#### INJUNCTION

- 4. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17535, Enjoined Persons, and each of them, are permanently enjoined and restrained from directly or indirectly engaging in any of the following acts or practices:
- a. Charging at the time of sale of a commodity, a value which is more than the price which is advertised, posted, marked, displayed or quoted, in violation of Business & Professions Code § 12024.2. Nothing herein will preclude Target from requiring that the consumer present the applicable advertisement or coupon at POS as a condition of obtaining the Advertised Price. However, any such presentment requirement must be clearly and conspicuously disclosed in the advertisement and/or coupon; and,
- b. Making or causing to be made any false or misleading statement to the public with respect to the price of items offered for sale.

5. Pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17535, and subject to the provisions of Business and Professions Code sections 17207 and 17535.5, Target is hereby enjoined and restrained from directly or indirectly using any type of scanning system at an existing or future California Target store unless Target maintains for a period of four (4) years from the date of entry of this Final Judgment, in every existing Target store in California, and in every new Target store to be opened in California during the four (4) year period, a program to enhance pricing accuracy and correct pricing errors. This program shall include at least all of the following:

a. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES. Target shall promptly implement written pricing accuracy policies and procedures ("Policies and Procedures") that incorporate the provisions in the Final Judgment. The Policies and Procedures shall be maintained in a Pricing Compliance Binder ("PCB") maintained in each Target store in California.

b. SIGNATURE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. All Target pricing personnel (as designated pursuant to subsection (c) below) shall be required to read the Policies and Procedures and sign an acknowledgement that they have read them and understand them. Target shall confirm its compliance with this provision by providing a sworn legible declaration to said effect, executed by an executive charged with responsibility for pricing programs to Steven C. Bolen, Contra Costa County District Attorney's Office, 627 Ferry Street, Martinez, 94553, by certified mail no later than one hundred and twenty (120) days from the entry of the Final Judgment.

#### c. APPOINTMENT OF PRICING PERSONNEL

i. CORPORATE PRICING PERSONNEL. Target shall appoint one central Pricing Compliance Captain ("PCC") who shall be responsible for overseeing, with respect to all stores in California: (1) the maintenance of accurate prices in the Price Scanning System, (2) price changes, and (3) prompt reporting, research, and resolution of Pricing Discrepancies in the system or stores. The PCC may delegate duties to other Target employees, appoint "back-up" PCCs, or retain third-party providers as the PCC deems reasonable and

 vii. If the PATL investigates and determines that the Pricing

Discrepancy was caused by a pricing error which extends beyond a single store, the PATL will

promptly notify the PCC of the Pricing Discrepancy.

viii. Said employee(s) shall record the results of each audit in the PCB, and the PATL shall retain said results of each audit in the PCB, and the PATL shall retain said results as provided in the "Retention of Records" provision herein. The recorded results of each audit shall include: (1) the date and approximate time of the audit, (2) the name and title of the person conducting the audit, (3) the number of items audited, (4) a list of pricing errors discovered, if any, during that audit and the corresponding items' description, correct price and scanned price, (5) a certification that the errors, if any, were corrected and a statement as to whether the PCC was notified, along with the time of the correction, if any, and notification, if any, and (6) the actions, if any, taken by the PCC and the determinations made pursuant to subparagraph (vii) above.

- e. VERIFICATION OF ACCURATE SCANNER PRICING. Each time an advertisement is distributed covering one or more products in two or more Target stores in California, Defendants shall cause the PATL of one designated California store to perform a price verification of a sample of all advertised items, to assure the advertised prices are scanning correctly on the effective date of the advertisement.
- f. SIGN TAKEDOW'N AUDITS. Every Target California PATL shall conduct on a weekly basis an audit to verify that the promotional sign takedown process set forth in the PCB was properly completed. The audit will consist of a review of all promotional signs in one aisle chosen at random from each quadrant of the store (i.e. a total of four aisles will be audited each week.) The audit results will be placed in the PCB for inspection by the PCC. The results shall be maintained as provided in the "Retention of Records" provision herein.
- g. END CAP AUDITS. Every Target California PATL shall conduct an audit to verify that all endcaps have been set and all items priced accurately. The audits will be conducted twice each week. The audit results will be placed in the PCE for inspection by the PCC. The results shall be maintained as provided in the "Retention of Records" provision herein.

h. IN-STORE REPORTS OF PRICING DISCREPANCIES. Whenever a Target store employee receives a Report of Pricing Discrepancy, the employee shall promptly investigate whether there is an error or request a store PATL to investigate the error. If the employee investigates and determines that a Pricing Discrepancy exists, the employee shall notify the PATL. The PATL shall take appropriate action to resolve the Pricing Discrepancy as soon as reasonably practicable, including, if necessary, by notifying the PCC. The PATL shall keep a log of Pricing Discrepancies that shall be maintained as provided in the "Retention of Records" provision herein.

i. REPORTS OF PRICING DISCREPANCIES TO THE PCC. When the PCC receives a Report of Pricing Discrepancy, the PCC shall promptly investigate whether a system error at the corporate level occurred. If a system error at the corporate level is verified, the PCC shall ensure appropriate action is taken to correct the system error as soon as reasonably practicable. The PCC shall make its best efforts to correct a system error within twenty-four (24) hours of verifying the error. The PCC also shall endeavor in good faith to take prompt interim action, as necessary, pending the resolution of a Pricing Discrepancy or correction of a Price Scanning System error.

j. EMPLOYEE TRAINING. All employees of each Target store shall participate in initial training that will reference pricing accuracy and instruct employees how to handle guest complaints regarding pricing errors. In addition, Pricing Accuracy Team Members shall participate in training sessions not less than twice each year. The training will cover topics to improve price accuracy, including the following:

- i. Price accuracy awareness.
- ii. Instructions on how to perform price accuracy best practices and insure that they are consistently executed.
  - iii. Instructions on how to address price accuracy issues with guests.

## RETENTION OF RECORDS

6. Target shall establish procedures to retain in-store audit records for at least one (1) year. Such records may be retained electronically rather than in paper copies and shall be made

available for inspection as soon as practical, but in any event not later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of the request of any Weights and Measures Official.

1

2

3

26

27

28

#### MONETARY RELIEF

7. 4 Defendant shall pay to Plaintiff, upon signing of the Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment, as and for costs, in the sum of One Hundred Two Thousand Two Hundred Two 5 Dollars and Eighty Nine Cents (\$102,202.89) by check made payable to the Marin County 6 7 District Attorney and delivered to Robert E. Nichols, Marin County District Attorney's Office, 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130, San Rafael, California 94903. Said costs shall be distributed 8 9 to the below listed entities as follows: California Department of Measurement Standards \$ 2,847.76 10 Alameda County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 1,963.50 Contra Costa County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 2,940.00 11 Fresno County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 1,557.72 Kern County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 410.64 12 Kings County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 1,362.02 13 Los Angeles Agricultural Commissioner \$ 35,964.86 \$ 1,926.94 Marin County Agricultural Commissioner 14 Merced County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 463.25 Monterey County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 1,568.50 15 Napa County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 462.00 Placer County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 625.00 16 Riverside County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 5,022.67 17 San Benito County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 346.28 San Bernardino County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 4,452.75 18 \$ 8,558.59 San Diego County Agricultural Commissioner San Joaquin County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 1,238.62 19 Santa Barbara County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 720.00 \$ 10,568.50 20 Santa Clara County Agricultural Commissioner Santa Cruz County Agricultural Commissioner \$1,144.00 21 Shasta County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 4,642.67 Solano County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 851.10 22 Sonoma County Agriculture Commissioner \$3,995.00 Stanislaus County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 711.58 23 Sutter County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 752.94 24 Tulare County Agricultural Commissioner \$812.00 Ventura County Agricultural Commissioner \$ 6,294.00 25

As provided by and pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17206 and
 17536, Defendant shall pay to Plaintiff, upon signing of the Stipulation for Entry of Final

Judgment, as civil penalties, the sum of One Million Two Hundred Ninety Three Thousand dollars (\$ 1,293,000) by check made payable to the Marin County District Attorney and delivered to Robert E. Nichols, Marin County District Attorney's Office, 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130, San Rafael, California 94903. Pursuant to Government Code Section 26506 said civil penalties shall be divided equally and paid to the city or county of each of the prosecuting agencies bringing this action.

- 9. Defendant shall pay to Plaintiff, upon signing of the Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment, the sum of Three Hundred and Twenty dollars (\$320.00) by check made payable to the Contra Costa County District Attorney and delivered to Steven C. Bolen, Contra Costa County District Attorney's Office, 627 Ferry Street, Martinez, 94553, reflecting the filing fee in this case, pursuant to Government Code section 6103.5.
- 10. The parties having stipulated, and the Court hereby finds, that it is impractical and impossible to identify or to provide direct restitution to consumers who may have unknowingly been charged an incorrect price for merchandise and that other forms of direct restitution are too impractical, costly, and would far exceed any benefit to individual consumers. Thus, Defendant shall pay restitution under the doctrine of cy pres pursuant to Business and Professions Code sections 17203 and 17535 as follows:
- a. The sum of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00), in the form of one hundred (100) individual Target gift cards for one-thousand dollars (\$1,000.00) each. Said gift cards shall be delivered to Robert E. Nichols, Marin County District Attorney's Office, 3501 Civic Center Drive, Room 130, San Rafael, California 94903; for distribution to state and local agencies charged with enforcement of pricing accuracy including County Departments of Weight and Measures and California Department of Measurement Standards offices throughout the State.
- b. The sum of One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000.00) as cy pres restitution to be divided equally between the Consumer Protection Prosecution Trust Fund established in the case of People v. ITT Consumer Financial Corporation (Alameda Superior Court No. 656038 0) and the California Agriculture Commissioner And Sealer's Association Quantity Control Trust Fund established pursuant to the Judgment in the People of the State of

5

6 7

8

9 10

12 13

11

14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

California v. Safeway Inc., et al., Sonoma County Superior Court, Case No. 233008 filed July 7, 2003. The payments required under this paragraph shall be made by one certified check payable to the "Marin County District Attorney's Trust Account" for distribution to the respective Trust Funds.

- c. The sum of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000.00) as cy pres restitution shall be paid to Marin Family Action. The Plaintiff shall assure that Marin Family Action uses these funds for the purpose of developing, promoting and distributing its Financial Literacy Program materials, said materials will include a curriculum, course materials and a course outline and will specifically provide information on how a consumer can assure they are correctly charged at the point of sale; said materials will be promoted statewide and made available by Marin Family Action to any California school (public or private) upon request. The payments required under this paragraph shall be made by one certified check payable to the "Marin County District Attorney's Trust Account" for distribution to Marin Family Action.
  - Defendant shall bear its own attorney's fees and costs.

### RETENTION OF JURISDICTION AND FINALITY

- 12. The Court retains jurisdiction for the purpose of enabling any party to this Final Judgment to apply to the Court at any time for such further orders and directions as may be necessary and appropriate for the construction or carrying out of this Final Judgment; for the modification or termination of any of its injunctive provisions; and for the enforcement of, compliance with, and punishment of violations of the Final Judgment. The parties waive the right to appeal this Final Judgment as to form and content.
- This Stipulated Final Judgment represents the complete and final settlement of all matters set forth in the Complaint filed contemporaneously with this Stipulated Final Judgment.

**EFFECTIVENESS** 14. This Final Judgment shall take effect immediately upon its filing and without the filing of a Notice of Entry of Final Judgment. The Clerk is directed to immediately enter this Final Judgment. DATED:

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT